PRIVATE
DEPOSITORY

ROYAL ASTRONOMICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. V. *April* 12, 1843. No. 30.

FRANCIS BAILY, Esq., President, in the Chair.

WILLIAM GRAVATT, Esq. F.R.S. was balloted for, and duly elected a Fellow of the Society.

The following communications were read:

I. Extract (translated) of a letter from M. Bessel to Professor Henderson, dated November 14, 1842. Communicated by Professor Henderson.

"We have just now commenced here the observations of another star which excites our hopes of a sensible parallax. It is No. 1830 of Groombridge's Catalogue; in regard to which star Argelander has found that it possesses a greater proper motion even than 61 *Cygni*. The star is not so advantageously placed as the latter. Besides, it is not a double star, and therefore not so well adapted for heliometric observations; but the two neighbouring stars with which we compare it have a highly favourable position, since they are on opposite sides and equally distant from it. We must only wait to see how far the observations will succeed, and whether the hopes of the parallax, sensibly surpassing the errors of observation, will be justified. If you should add any thing new to your results of α *Centauri* you would give me much pleasure by communicating it.

"I have been much occupied with my Circle of Repsold, that is to say, with the examination of its divisions. I have here met with a difficulty before unknown to me, namely, the great influence of the inequality of the temperature in the interior of the observatory, on the figure of the circle, and also on the magnitude of the interval between its divisions. When I observe a diameter with two opposite microscopes, and then, turning the circle through 180°, repeat the observation, I obtain thereby the distance of this diameter from the axis of rotation of the instrument. This distance ought to be unalterable; but, after some time, I frequently find a difference amounting to a second of space, which can only arise from an irregular influence of the temperature. Hence it follows that a great number of repetitions of the estimation of the errors of the divisions of any part of the circle are necessary, before we can place that confidence in the mean result, which must be attained, if the estimation is to be *indeed* useful. I imagine that this effect of temperature has an influence also on your circle, and perhaps to a still greater extent, and I should read with considerable interest a communication from you on this subject."

II. Letter from Professor Henderson to the Secretary, dated March 23, 1843, on the Great Comet of 1843.

The object of this letter was chiefly to fulfil a promise made in a letter from Professor Henderson to the Secretary, dated Nov. 1, 1842, to send to the Society the elements of the comet of 1668, which appeared to him worthy of more notice than it had received. Mr. Henderson cites the following works relatively to this comet: Newton's *Principia*, book iii. prop. 41; *Phil. Trans.* Nos. 35 and 150; and Pingré's *Cométographie*, vol. ii. p. 22.

The elements obtained by him from the best data which he could find are as follow:

Time of Perihelion Passage, 1668, Feb. 24·8, new style, Greenwich mean time.

Log. Perihelion Distance	9·3999
Perihelion Longitude	40° 9′
Long. of Node	193 26
Inclination	27 7

III. Elements of the Great Comet of 1843, with an Ephemeris, from the Observations of March 20, 22, and 25, reported in Professor Schumacher's Circular. By Professor Henderson.

Time of Perihelion Passage, Feb. 27·50, Greenwich mean time.

Log. Perihelion Distance	7·61348 (less than sun's semidiameter)
Longitude of Perihelion	279° 29′
——— Ascending Node	359 43
Inclination	35 58

Motion retrograde.

Ephemeris for 9^h *Greenwich mean time.*

Day.	R.A.	Declination.	Distance from Sun.	Distance from Earth.
1843.	h m s	° ′		
April 5	4 22 44	−5 29	1·22	1·52
6	4 26 8	−5 19	1·24	1·55
7	4 29 28	−5 9	1·26	1·58
8	4 32 44	−4 59	1·28	1·61
9	4 35 52	−4 50	1·30	1·64
10	4 38 52	−4 40	1·33	1·67
11	4 41 48	−4 31	1·35	1·70
12	4 44 44	−4 23	1·37	1·73
13	4 47 32	−4 15	1·39	1·76
14	4 50 20	−4 7	1·41	1·79

IV. Letter from Lieutenant G. B. G. Downes, Royal Engineers, to Professor Henderson. Communicated by Professor Henderson.

"*Barbadoes, West Indies, March 7th*, 1843.

"My dear Sir,—I wish to take the opportunity of sending you by this mail a short account of the remarkable phenomenon, now known to be a comet, which has been visible in this latitude for

about a week past. It was first seen by me on the second instant soon after sunset, as a light rising only a few degrees above the horizon, and bearing little south of the true west. Some parties in the island, however, state that they saw a similar appearance for the first time on the 28th ultimo. For the first few evenings various were the conjectures as to what it might be. Lunar rainbows, volcanic eruptions at some distant island, being called into play to account for it. On the 3d instant, the view of it was similar, excepting that the arc occupied by the light was much increased, and it issued from a cloud low in the horizon. On the 4th instant, about half an hour before sunset the light again appeared quite clear of the horizon, and was evidently a comet of large magnitude, the nucleus being distinctly visible to the naked eye. The nucleus subsequently became buried in a cloud; and a similar cause prevented any accurate observations of it being made on the following evening, viz. the 5th instant. Last night, the 6th instant, it appeared to great advantage, not only the nucleus being visible to the naked eye, but even the contraction and elongation of the tail could be detected. I noted the time of sunset as exactly six o'clock, the sun bearing about 9° south of west. At half past six I took the bearing of the nucleus as 18° south of west; and at 7^h 25^m the nucleus set at a bearing of 20° south of west. The arc subtended by the tail varied in proportion to its contraction and elongation, which I have before referred to;—it certainly never occupied a less space than 30°, and increased to about 35°. From the brightness of the moon, and its proximity to the comet, it was difficult to trace the exact position of the nucleus. I have no doubt, however, that yesterday it was situated in *Pisces*, the tail extending to the constellation of *Aries*. It is evidently receding from the sun, with which its recent path must almost have been in conjunction. As this comet, from its situation, will, of course, be equally visible in England, this memorandum can only be useful as noting its first appearance in this latitude. As it has not been predicted I am most anxious to hear of the observations made at our observatories at home. You will already have heard of the calamitous earthquake that has visited some of the islands in the West Indies. Of course, there will not be persons wanting to connect the sudden appearance of the comet with it. There is no apparent change of temperature, the thermometer in the shade at three o'clock in the day being about 80°, at which hour the comet is not many degrees from our zenith. It cannot be detected by the naked eye, or by any telescopes we have here, until about an hour before sunset. I close this at the last moment for the English packet, and in great haste believe me," &c. &c.

V. Letter from Professor Henderson to the Secretary, on the Great Comet of 1843.

Edinburgh, April 10, 1843.

My dear Sir,—There is considerable probability for the supposition, which I see has been taken up in Professor Schumacher's second

circular, that the late comet is the same as the one which appeared in 1668. I am in possession of a map representing the apparent track of the latter in the heavens as seen at Goa, in the East Indies, from the 9th to the 21st of March. It is entitled "Observationes Goæ habitæ circa Phœnomenum cœleste quod apparuit mense Martis, Anno 1668, Romam missæ ad P. Ægidium Franciscum de Gottignies in Collegio Romano Matheseos Professorem;" and it seems to have formed part of the work entitled "Ægidius Franc. de Gottignies de figuris Cometarum qui an. 1664, 1665, 1668 apparuerunt, cum animadversionibus et tabulis in æs incisis Romæ 1668," mentioned by Weidler (*Historia Astronomiæ*, p. 508), and La Lande (*Bibliographie Astronomique*, p. 271). This work may contain other information about the comet, and may probably be found in libraries. The map is sufficiently rough, and I find that the relative positions of the stars are sometimes a degree out; nevertheless, by comparing the places of the termination of the tail nearest the sun, which I suppose denote the nucleus, with those of the neighbouring stars, I have obtained places of the comet as in the subjoined table, which also contains places calculated for the orbit of the late comet from the following assumed elements:

Perihelion Passage 1668, Feb. 28·8, new style, Greenwich Time.

Longitude of Perihelion	277° 2′
Longitude of Ascending Node	357 17
Inclination of Orbit	35 58
Logarithm of Perihelion Distance	7·68000

Motion retrograde.

The Time of Observation on Each Day assumed to be 2^h *Mean Time at Greenwich.*

Date, New Style.	Place by Map.		Place Computed.		Difference.	
	R.A.	Declination.	R.A.	Declination.	R.A.	Declin.
1668.	° ′	° ′	° ′	° ′	′	′
March 9	18 49	− 10 50	16 46	− 10 16	+ 123	− 34
10	20 51	10 7	19 59	10 10	+ 52	+ 3
11	23 8	9 23	23 1	10 2	+ 7	+ 39
12	25 10	8 59	25 53	9 52	− 43	+ 57
13	27 53	8 37	28 36	9 42	− 43	+ 65
14	30 22	8 23	31 11	9 28	− 49	+ 65
15	32 52	8 39	33 38	9 15	− 46	+ 36
16	34 45	8 22	35 58	9 1	− 73	+ 39
17	37 57	8 15	38 10	8 46	− 13	+ 31
18	41 26	8 39	40 15	8 30	+ 71	− 9
19	45 8	8 49	42 12	8 14	+ 176	− 35
20	48 34	8 50	44 3	7 57	+ 271	− 53
21	52 8	− 8 41	45 47	− 7 40	+ 381	− 61

"On inspecting the daily differences of the places by map, it is evident that they are affected with considerable errors; and although it appears that they be within such distances of the places in the assumed orbit as to warrant a presumption that the comets are the same, and although these distances may be diminished by a better determination of places from the map, and a better assumption of elements, yet the identity cannot be held to be conclusively ascertained; for the observed places are in that situation when the problem of determining a comet's orbit acquires an indeterminate character, and when the results obtained from any mode of solution are greatly affected by errors of observation. In fact, as I formerly mentioned to you, I obtained from these observations an orbit so widely different from the one I have just assumed, as not to bear the least resemblance to it, and yet the places in the former orbit agree better with the places in the map than those computed in the latter orbit.

"The later places of the comet, from the map, may have been much influenced by the decreasing light of the nucleus, and the increasing moonlight. The new moon was on March 12. The places from the map may belong to the apparent termination of the tail, the nucleus and adjoining part of the tail having become invisible, and on this supposition the agreement may be much better."

VI. Letter from T. Forster, Esq., dated Bruges, March 22, 1843, on the Great Comet.

Mr. Forster first saw the train of the comet on March 18, at about eight o'clock, while making a sweep of the western part of the heavens. It appeared as a broad band of bright white light, of about 6° in breadth, commencing from the horizon just where it is cut by the equator, and including the star γ *Ceti* just within its northern boundary-line. It passed through the constellation *Lepus*, including in its light the four stars of the *Hare's Ears*, where it was 3° in breadth, and finally became evanescent between *Sirius* and β *Canis Majoris*. From this direction it appears that it did not lie in a straight line; but this appearance, the author thinks, may be due to the effect of difference of refraction.

On March 20, when the train was again seen, it was accompanied, from $8^h\ 7^m$ to $8^h\ 25^m$, by a very sudden and bright aurora borealis, darting upwards from the base of the train, and illuminating the sky to beyond the *Bull's Horns*, and finishing by a wide diffusion of yellow light.

VII. Second Letter from T. Forster, Esq., dated Bruges, March 28, 1843, on the Great Comet.

In this letter the author desires to correct an error in his letter of the 22d of March: "The band of light described as issuing from the horizon at γ *Ceti*, and being 16°* broad at its base, and 3° at

* In the letter of March 22, it is mentioned as being 6° in breadth, probably through an error of transcribing.

its vertex, was not the light suspected to be a comet's tail, but a luminous envelope, whose axis exactly coincided with it, and which, as it were, sheathed it on the 20th inst. This phenomenon was not repeated on the 21st, since which the train of light issuing from the horizon a little north-west of *γ Eridani* has not exceeded 1° 15′ in breadth, and extends to *α Leporis*. But on Sunday night it was again traceable, though very faintly, over *β Canis Majoris*, nearly to above *Sirius*.

"On Sunday it was again accompanied by a sort of aurora borealis, consisting of a broad cone of whitish light, whose axis, if we may so speak, would have cut the equator at an acute angle, between *Menkar* and *δ Ceti*. Its superstructure extended upwards as before, and involved the *Pleiades*, where it became suffused and mixed with the surrounding twilight."

VIII. Letter from James Nasmyth, Esq., to Sir J. F. W. Herschel, on an early Observation of the Train of the Great Comet. Communicated by Sir J. F. W. Herschel, Bart.

Patricroft, near Manchester, March 28, 1843.

"Sir,—I sincerely trust you will pardon this intrusion on your attention, as I wish to communicate to you what occurs to me may be in some slight degree interesting to you, in regard to an observation I made about eight o'clock in the evening of Tuesday, the 7th of March, at which time, while looking at the moon with a 7½-inch Newtonian reflector, I observed near it and the *Pleiades, a well defined ray of light*, which I could trace along distinctly with the telescope for several degrees. The position of the stream of light I have endeavoured to convey to you by the inclosed rude sketch: it was well defined on one edge, and had a slow motion upwards, as seen by the inverted position due to the telescope. I was enabled to observe its motion by the edge of the stream of light being near to one of the stars of the *Pleiades* when I observed it first, which distance was considerably altered and increased when I observed it about an hour afterwards.

"It occurs to me, that the fact of my having seen this stream of faint light at that time, and in that position, may derive some additional interest in reference to the comet which you have been lately engaged in observing, and as the date (7th March) *and the position* is pretty clearly given by my observation, it has occurred to me that the fact may claim to be interesting to you.

"Two days afterwards, I communicated the observation I had made of this stream of light to my friend Mr. Lassels of Liverpool, who, not being able to account for it, was induced to suppose it to be due to some temporary derangement of my telescope; but this was by no means the case, in so much as the stream of light in question held its due position in reference to the moon and stars near to it, whatever alteration I made in the position of the telescope. I could with the greatest distinctness trace along its outline for

several degrees upwards from the horizon, but the light of the moon rendered it invisible on the side next that of the then first quarter moon: it was a *position* object in the telescope.—I am, &c.

"JAMES NASMYTH.

"The angle formed between the edge of the stream of light and the line of the horns of the moon was, as near as I could judge, about 120°. When the stream of light was viewed at some distance from the moon, say ten diameters or so, it was so distinct as to divide the field very plainly, occupying any portion due to the position of the telescope, but always with the same inclination with respect to the horizon.

"The motion, with respect to the increasing distance between the edge of the stream of light and the star nearest, was sufficiently rapid to render the space between very evidently increased in the interval of one hour.

"Telescope, 7 feet 6 inches focal length, Newtonian: power employed, about 70."

IX. Letter from M. C. L. Littrow, Director of the Observatory of Vienna, on the Great Comet. Communicated by T. Galloway, Esq.

"My Dear Sir,—From the following observations, made at the observatory of Vienna:—

	Mean Time of Vienna.	R. A.	Dec.
	h m s	° ′ ″	° ′ ″
March 18,	7 49 11	42 15 0	−9 59 30
— 21,	7 28 27	47 18 45	−8 56 19
— 23,	7 42 30	50 33 45	−8 23 54

"I have deduced the elements of the new comet's orbit as follows:—

Passage through its Perihelion Feb. 27·855. mean time Vienna.

Longitude of Perihelion	186° 38′
Longitude of the Ascending Node	352 5
Inclination	40 53
Log. of the Shortest Distance from the Sun	9.76094

Motion retrograde.

As it appears from these elements, the comet has no striking resemblance with any former one. In regard to its geocentric path, it is one of the most remarkable bodies we have observed till now. It was in the constellation of Antinous in the last days of January, at a distance of only 31,000,000 of German miles, and was therefore visible in the oriental heavens; perhaps the astronomers of the austral hemisphere, the attention of whom was excited by the comet of Laugier, had observed it at that time. Even at its passage through the perihelion (Feb. 28), it was visible in Aquarius. During the first days of March, it was lost in the rays of the sun, and began at last to be visible for southern observers on the 5th of March. As it stands on this day between us and the sun, at a distance of

only 8,000,000 of German miles from the earth, and as its train is at least 12,000,000 of German miles long, and 4,000,000 broad, it is not impossible, that we have passed this train without perceiving it, and that for a short time it had been possible to see the comet before the sun. As my elements are not yet exact, I cannot more nearly examine these conjectures. It passed the plane of the ecliptic in a point, situated between the orbits of Mercury and Venus, but rather far from these two planets. From the 5th of March it removes at the same time from the sun and the earth, and therefore decreases so much in its light. I believe the whole visibility will not be longer than till the first days of May, till when it does not step over the limits of the constellation Eridanus. For the naked eye it probably ceases to be visible on the 1st of April, as the moon will prevent from this day its appearance.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
&c. &c. &c.
CH. L. LITTROW,

Vienna, 1*st April*, 1843.

X. Circular letter from Professor Schumacher, dated March 26, 1843, on the Great Comet.

In this letter notices are given of the observations of Mr. Cooper and Sir John Herschel, which have been already sufficiently published in England. A letter was received from M. Humboldt, dated March 22, announcing that M. Galle had found the head of the comet in the twilight on the 20th. At eight o'clock it was $1\frac{1}{2}^\circ$ west and 1′ north of ζ Eridani. M. Galle estimated the length of the tail at about 40°.

At Altona, two single observations were made just before the comet disappeared behind the houses, but which, from the circumstances under which they were made, are of necessity not very accurate. They are for Altona mean time:

	h m	R. A.	Decl.
Mar. 24	8 20	52° 7′	−8° 5′
25	8 12	53 30·4	−7 52

In a postscript, dated March 28, it is announced that M. Littrow had made at Vienna a not altogether satisfactory observation of the comet on the 18th of March, at $7^h\ 49^m\ 11^s$, Vienna mean time.

R. A. $2^h\ 49^m\ 0^s$. Decl. $-9^\circ\ 59'\ 30''$.

M. Galle, at the Observatory of Berlin, announced on the 25th of March, that he had computed the following elements from his observations of March 20, 21 and 22,

T	1843, Feb. 27·4567	
Log. q	8·053966	
π	274° 30′ 4″·9	} From the mean
Ω	357 43 25·2	} Equinox of Mar. 0.
i	36 22 19.8	

Motion retrograde.

The observations of the comet, still affected with aberration and parallax, are, for 8^h Berlin mean time,

Mar. 20	R. A. = 45° 42′ 30″	Decl. = − 9° 13′ 40″
21	47 25 30	8 56 40
22	49 3 27·5	8 40 0
24	52 4 58·7	8 7 27·6

The above elements give for the error of the mean of these observations in geocentric latitude and longitude,

$$+ 11''{\cdot}4 \text{ and } + 5''{\cdot}1,$$

and the rectangular co-ordinates reckoned on the equator from the mean equinox of March 0, are

$$x = r\,[9{\cdot}999880]\ \sin\,(175^\circ\ 3'\ 19''{\cdot}8 + \nu)$$
$$y = r\,[9{\cdot}983921]\ \sin\,(265\ 21\ 51{\cdot}7 + \nu)$$
$$z = r\,[9\ 350754]\ \sin\,(\ 79\ 10\ 44{\cdot}5 + \nu)$$

M. Rümcker had observed the comet at the Observatory of Hamburg, on March 25, at $8^h\ 32^m$ mean time.

R. A. = 53° 34′ 34″ Decl. = − 7° 52′ 29″.

XI. Second circular letter from Professor Schumacher, dated March 31, 1843, on the Great Comet.

On the 23d of March, the following observations and elements had been furnished by M. Plantamour, Director of the Observatory of Geneva.

For Geneva mean time:

Mar. 18	7 h 34 m 38 s	R. A. = 2 h 47 m 57·18 s	Decl. = − 9° 47′ 52″
19	7 33 33	2 55 35·46	9 30 47
21	7 27 30	3 9 41·30	8 56 50

From these observations he computed the following elements:

T	1843, Feb. 27·4882
q	0·0045
ϖ	279° 12′ 11″
Ω	359 53 21
i	36 0 27

Motion retrograde.

From these elements the comet must have been nearer to the sun than any one which is known to us, nearer even than the comet of 1680.

Mr. Cooper believes the present comet to be identical with the comets of 1668 and 1702. But if this were the case, it must, on the 27th of February of the present year, have completed its fourth revolution since the year 1702, and this would give for its period $35\frac{1}{4}$ years, instead of 34 years, which is the interval between 1668 and 1702. It also does not seem easy to account for its not having been seen at its intermediate reappearances. It appears, however, worth while to try whether it is probable that it is identical with the

comet of 1702, an account of the observations of which by Maraldi, on the 2nd of March, appears in the Memoirs of the Academy of Sciences for 1702. To determine this more accurately, M. Peterson, using Galle's elements, computed the place of the comet for March 2, 1702. He reduced the perihelion and node to 1702, and found, with different assumptions for the time of the passage through the perihelion (for which he assumed successively Feb. 19·5, Feb. 21, Feb. 21·5, Feb. 23, and Feb. 26), the place of the comet.

	Feb. 19·5.	Feb. 21.	Feb. 21·5.	Feb. 23.	Feb. 26.
Long.	6° 18′	3° 12′	2° 3′	358° 50′	351° 48′
Lat.	− 20 3	− 17 55	−17 6	− 14 48	− 9 12

None of these hypotheses satisfy the position of the train given for the 2nd of March, when we consider that it must pass through the sun.

The discussion of an observation by Martin Brouwer, which is found in the Introduction to the Universal Geography of Struyck, seems also to shew that it is not identical with the comet of 1702.

With respect to the comet of 1668. Cassini has traced on a map of the stars the position of the train for three days, March 10, 14, and 19. For these days Galle's elements give (assuming the perihelion passage to be on Feb. 27·5) the following places of the comet.

Mar. 10·5	Long. = 19° 36′	Lat. − 20° 4′	Sun's long. = 351° 11′
14.5	29 51	22 46	355 10
19·5	40 16	24 38	0 8

If we trace on the map these places of the comet and the sun, the situation of the train agrees, as nearly as we can determine from this map, with the place of the comet.

Pingré, in his *Cométographie*, Part II., p. 22, mentions an observation of this comet made by Father Valentin Estancel, in St. Salvador, on the 7th of March. The head of the comet is a little beneath, and on one side of *θ Ceti*, the end of the train was in contact with *ζ Ceti*. It is not mentioned on which side of *θ Ceti* the comet was, but the data for the position of the train shew that it was to the left of the observer, or towards the south. Calculation gives

Long. of Comet 10° 39′
Lat. of Comet − 16 59

which is within the limits of the accuracy of the observation.

According to these calculations it is very possible that our comet is identical with that of 1668, which would give a period of revolution of 175 years. We find in the *Cométographie* of Pingré, vague notices of comets for 1493, 1317, 1143, 968, 442, and 268.

In a postscript, the following observations are announced as having been received from Rome:

	h m s	h m s	
Mar. 18	7 30 50·5	R.A. = 2 47 47	Decl. −9° 50′ 55″·4
19	7 58 35·8	2 55 37	−9 30 43·7
20	7 38 44·5	3 2 44	−9 13 6·1

Also in a letter of the 26th of March, from Professor Encke, the following observations, made at his observatory, and reduced for convenience to 8^h Berlin mean time were contained.

Mar. 20	R. A. $45^\circ\ 42'\ 30''0$	Decl. $-9^\circ\ 13'\ 40''0$
21	47 25 30·0	8 56 40·0
22	49 3 27·5	8 39 59·9
24	52 4 58·7	8 7 27·6
25	53 29 17·1	7 51 46·6
26	54 49 33·0	7 36 27·6
27	56 6 20·6	7 21 25·3
28	57 19 47·3	7 7 4·4

Professor Encke deduced the orbit from the observations of the 20th, 24th, and 28th of March, taking account of the small corrections. These gave the following elements:

T	1843, Feb. 27·40162	
Log. q	7·482318	
ϖ	$281^\circ\ 21'\ 19''9$	From the mean
Ω	5 51 7·7	Equinox of Mar. 0.
i	35 0 34·0	

Motion retrograde.

$$x = r\,[9{\cdot}999256]\ \sin\ (v + 169^\circ\ 41'\ 52''4)$$
$$y = r\,[9{\cdot}991363]\ \sin\ (v + 259\ 1\ 17{\cdot}6)$$
$$z = r\,[9{\cdot}313776]\ \sin\ (v + 95\ 51\ 47{\cdot}8)$$

XII. The President announced that he had received notices of the comet from the Islands of St. Vincent's and St. Christopher's.

In a letter from St. Vincent's, dated March 5, the writer states that it had been seen for the previous three days, being very brilliant, of a pale colour, and with the nucleus very distinct.

At St. Christopher's the comet was seen first on the 2nd of March, but then only as a streak of light, and not visible much above the horizon. It soon became quite distinct, but on the 8th it appeared to be fast receding. It appears to have caused considerable consternation in the island.

XIII. A Memoir on Astronomical Drawing. By Piazzi Smyth, Esq. Communicated by Capt. W. H. Smyth, R. N.

This paper was partly read, and will be concluded at the next meeting.

London :—Printed by Moyes and Barclay, Castle Street, Leicester Square.